



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,068	09/26/2003	Hea-Chun Lee	SWO-0004	9296
7590	09/09/2005		EXAMINER	
David A. Fox Cantor Colburn LLP 55 Griffin Road South Bloomfield, CT 06002			NGUYEN, DUNG T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/673,068	LEE, HEA-CHUN
	Examiner Dung Nguyen	Art Unit 2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2005.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 and 19-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-16, 19, 21, 23 and 29-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 20, 22, 27 and 28 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's amendment date 06/24/2005 has been received and entered. By the amendment, claims 1-15 and 19-33 are now pending in the application.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 2, it is confusing and unclear the limitation of "spacing part" and "a spacing part" in claim 1 are the same element. It is assumed, for the purposes of the examination, that such "spacing part" in claim 2 would be the same as in the based claim 1.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 1-4, 6-10, 13-15, 19, 21, 23-26 and 31-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being anticipated by Iwamoto et al., US Patent No. 5,046,826.

The above claims are anticipated by Iwamoto et al. figures 1 and 7 which disclose a liquid crystal display (LCD) apparatus (figure 1) comprising:  
an LCD panel (6);

- .. a first space (left area) receiving a first lamp assembly (101-1 and lamp reflector 103-1 on left side) disposed adjacent to the first guide plate (108 on left side);
- .. a second space (right area) receiving a second lamp assembly (101-1 and lamp reflector 103-1 on right side) disposed adjacent to the second guide plate (108 on right side);
- .. a spacing part (107-2) therebetween;
- .. reflector/auxiliary reflector 103-1, a diffuser 104 having a convexo-concave pattern (see figure 7);
- .. a mold frame (107)

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Claims 1-2, 6-7, 10, 13-15, 19, 21, 24-25 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(b) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto et al., US Patent No. 5,956,107.

Regarding the above claims, Hashimoto et al. disclose a liquid crystal display (LCD) apparatus (200) (figure 2) comprising:

- .. an LCD panel (4);
- .. a backlight assembly (5-8)
- .. a first lamp assembly (3) next to a first guide plate (1a);
- .. a second lamp assembly (8) next to a second guide plate (9)
- .. a spacing part (e.g., a shading slit film 5) disposed between two lamp assemblies;

Although Hashimoto et al. do not disclose a mold frame (including front and rear frames), it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ a mold frame for the Hashimoto et al display since it is a common practice in the art for supporting all optical element as well as securing them in a display device.

7. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Iwamoto et al., US Patent No. 5,046,826.

Regarding claim 5, Iwamoto et al. disclose the claimed invention as described above except for a blocking protrusion. One of ordinary skill in the art would have realized the desire to form a blocking protrusion to block a reflector in a fixed position. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made employ a blocking protrusion in the Iwamoto et al. auxiliary reflector in order to avoid a movable auxiliary-reflector by blocking the auxiliary reflector in a fixed position.

8. Claims 11-12 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hashimoto et al., US Patent No. 5,956,107 and/or Iwamoto et al., US Patent No. 5,046,826, in view of Applicant's admitted prior art (APA), figure 1.

Regarding claims 11-12, Hashimoto et al. and/or Iwamoto et al. disclose the claimed invention as described above except for a front frame, a rear frame as well as a printer circuit board (PCB) and a flexible printer circuit (FPC). APA, figure does disclose a front frame (126), a rear frame (125) and PCB/FPC (150/140) can be formed in a display device (100). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to employ front and rear frames and PCB/FPC in the Hashimoto et al. and/or Iwamoto et al. device,

since it is a common practice in the art for supporting a light guiding plate as well as driving the display through PCB/FPC.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

9. Claims 20, 22 and 27-28 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Response to Arguments***

10. Applicant's arguments filed 06/24/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that both Hashimoto et al. and Iwamoto et al. fail to disclose or teach the element of "a spacing part disposed between the first and second lamp assemblies". The Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant's viewpoint since the same is true of the Hashimoto et al. and Iwamoto et al. spacing part. In particular, Hashimoto et al. do disclose the spacing part (5) disposing between the first lamp assembly (3) and the second lamp assembly (8) as well as Iwamoto et al. disclose the spacing part (107-2) disposing between the first lamp assembly (left 101-1/103-1) and the second lamp assembly (right 101-1/103-1) as stated above.

Since Hashimoto et al and Iwamoto et al. do disclose such feature of "a spacing part disposed between the first and second lamp assemblies", the obviousness rejection would be proper.

Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-15, 19, 21, 23-26 and 29-33 stand.

***Conclusion***

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-2297. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert H. Kim can be reached on 571-272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



*Dung Nguyen*  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2871

DN  
09/02/2005